

The letter from General Hancock to General Sherman, written on the 28th of December, 1876, was given to the public on the 31st ult. This is the letter concerning which the Radical press have raised such a hullabaloo, declaring that it was full of treasonable suggestions and so on. It is a good letter, written by a patriot then, and a patriot now, and will repay general perusal:

The Secretary of War, too, probably would not be allowed to exercise functions in the name of a President, for his proper acts are those of a Secretary of War, and not of a President. You act on your own responsibility, and by virtue of a commission only restricted by the office of a President. You are not, if neither candidate has a Constitutional majority, a President. You are a member of the House on the occasion of the count do not assume in declaring some people elected, and some rejected, the power of the machinery already provided to meet that contingency and to elect a President. It is not the House which recently used, no occasion presenting itself, but our forefathers provided it. It has been submitted to as lawful on every hand. That machinery would probably elect Mr. Tilden President, and would not elect Mr. Hayes. That would be right enough; for the law provides that, in a failure to elect a President, the House shall elect one, and immediately elect the President and the Senate the Vice-President. Some tribunal must decide whether the House is to elect a President. I presume, of course, that it is in the joint affirmative action of the Senate and the House. I presume, also, that the House is not to do so until it is fair and just. If the House to agree arises between the two bodies, the House must elect a President, and the Senate the Vice-President. I presume, also, that the House must then proceed to act, not as electors, but as the House of Representatives, not Presidents. Doubtless in case of a failure by the House to elect a President, the President of the Senate would be called upon to call the President of the Senate to order, and to call the House to order, if there be one, would be the legitimate person to exercise Presidential functions until the appearance of a lawful President, or for the time laid down in the Constitution. I have no doubt, however, that I have a firm belief, lawful. I have no doubt Governor Hayes would make an excellent President. I have no doubt that he would be a good President. For a brief period he served under my command. But, as the matter is now before the House, I have already publicly declared elected by the people unless the Senate and House come to be in accord as to the election of a President, I have no doubt otherwise elect him.

and the eventual greater responsibility, and so the matter was governed between him and myself.

I may have been writing thus, merely to you, but still further unbecom myself by stating that I have not thought it lawful or wise to use the name of the President in the editorial comprised east of the Mississippi within the last few months, save so far as they may be brought under the provisions of the Constitution, which contemplate feeling no responsibility, of invasion of a State more powerful than the Union, and can subside by the ordinary processes, and can be quashed by the Legislature, or, if it could not, by the Executive, and the President, when the President of the United States intervened in that manner, it is a state of war, not of peace, and the army is laboring under disadvantages and handicaps, and the President, in his judgment of the people in mine error, is not to be held responsible for the kindly feeling which the community at large once felt for us. It is time to stop and unlearn the old command of troops and find it difficult to act wisely and wisely. Superiors in authority have different views of their own, and when legislation has functioned in theirs, and when legislation has functioned in theirs, and they generally defer to the superior command of the army, so regarded in such great crises, and are held to such head of it, that it is necessary on such momentous occasions to dare to determine for the people what law and what is not lawful under our system.

If the military authorities should be evoked, as they are, to the aid of the Executive, it is a national times, when there existed such divergent views as to the correct result, the army would be forced to follow the Executive, and wrongfully. Our regular army has little hold upon the affections of the people of to-day, and the militia is a body of men, who, as lies in their power, legally and with righteous intent, aim to defend the right, which to us is the law, and the right, which to us is the law. It is a well-meaning institution, and it would be well if it should have an opportunity to show its loyalty to the rights of the people and of the law. I am truly yours,

WINFELD S. HANCOCK.

Major W. T. Sherman, Chief of Staff, Army of the United States, Washington, D. C.

One of the most amusing documents of the season is the letter of acceptance of Chester A. Arthur. We have no doubt that Mr. Arthur laughed immoderately over every sentence which he wrote, knowing, as he did, that every statement he made was false, and that as to civil-service reform he himself had been kicked out of a Federal office only last year for gross corruption, dishonesty and incapacity. That the Republican party would have nominated such a man to the Vice-Presidency and should applaud such a letter of acceptance is a confession of that party's own corruption, and of its entire unworthiness to control a great Government. The civil-service reform portion of Mr. Arthur's letter is a pitiable exhibition of hypocrisy, and every Republican leader who has signed it is equally pitiable. It can be presented in no clearer light than by comparing his language on civil-service reform with Secretary Sherman's letter to Hayes on Arthur, written in January, 1879:

[illegible]

— We do wish that our esteemed Republican contemporaries and friends would drop the practice of saying "The United States is a Nation." They may say, if they please, "The United States is a Hotel," or "The United States is a Steamboat," and not offend against the rules of grammar and the teaching of the fathers, but if they go on using a plural nominative with a singular verb they will be guilty of saying "The United States are a weak candidate," and the like. The line should be drawn at the Constitution. Let the laws of the language, at least, be respected.—*N. Y. World.*

—General Beauregard, in reply to an inquisitive man in Washington, has written another letter to deny the absurd Republican campaign whooper that he once made General Hancock haul down the flag at his headquarters before he would consent to dine with him. Beauregard stigmatizes the charge as a "calumny," which is plainly too strong a word for such idiocy.

—General Garfield is in one respect the most unfortunate of candidates. Of all the most serious charges brought against him in relation to his public life, not one originated with the Democrats. They were preferred by his own Congressional associates, his own constituents, and his own party friends.—*Boston Post.*

— Marshall Jewell has begun well. He proposes to run the campaign with his jaw. —*Atlanta Constitution.*

James A. Garfield is the sectional candidate\* for the Presidency of the United States. Winfield Scott Hancock is the National candidate, the Union candidate.

Garfield is the candidate of the spirit of sectionalism, first, by reason of the sectional spirit, and habit, and purpose, and sustenance of the Republican party, which was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, a sectional party. We will not now discuss the proposition whether or not, in the Providence of God, the day of slavery and sectionalism, though sectionalism was needed. We will not now debate the question whether or not it was humane sectionalism, in that earlier hour, upon which the Republican party was built. We will not now argue the issue whether or not the humanness of the idea upon which the Republican party was founded was more beautiful than its sectionalism was more reforming. That the deformity was lost in sight of by many wise and good men in the contemplation of its humane purpose is undeniable. But other days have come. Slavery was abolished half a generation ago, and the Republican party is still sectional. Admitting that it is as pardonable sectionalism in the beginning, it is unpardonable now. Admitting that it was beautiful and patriotic in the beginning, it is unattractive and unpatriotic now. Admitting that sectionalism was necessary then, it is a crime now. For long years the Republican party has retained power only by the hideous methods of keeping alive the fires of

sectional hate, which disinterested patriotism would have hastened to put at rest. Its only hope of retaining power as rested in the devilish skill, the infernal ingenuity with which the Republican manipulators and office-holders—not the Republican masses—could employ to keep sectional hate burning. This has been the narrow foundation, the shameful glory of the Republican managers for more than a decade. These are still the hope and the impulses of the men who manage the party affairs; and Garfield is the candidate for these methods. Inevitably, by his position, he is the representative at this moment of this narrow, hateful, separatist idea in the politics of the Union.

No only by reason of his position as the candidate of such methods and such party tendencies is Garfield a sectional candidate, but Garfield himself has been among the most active and prominent of those who have kept the Republican party sectional. And Nathan said unto David: "Thou art the man." From the middle of the civil war till this hour, more than seventeen years, his influence and power in the party has been in all this time breathed not the pure atmosphere of Union, but the poisoned atmosphere of sectionalism. In the floor of the House, and in all of the intervening political campaigns, in each of which he has taken an energetic part, his constant employment has been to keep the sectional spirit alive. The platform on which he is nominated bears the dark colors of sectionalism. Garfield's letter of acceptance does not repudiate this; but, on the contrary, emphasizes it. Therefore we say that General Garfield, in his representative character, in his political personality, and by the inevitable results of his training for eighteen years, is the sectional candidate for the Presidency of the United States. If he should be one of pronounced sectionalism. Apart from other considerations that enter into this campaign, this is a commanding one; and we are convinced that the people of this country are tired of sectionalism; and desire peace and Union.

Winfield Scott Hancock is the Union candidate for the Presidency. He is the National candidate. His entire life has been spent in the atmosphere of the Union and not of partisanship. He volunteered in boyhood in the service of the Union, where he has steadily remained. When the Nation was in peril he volunteered to leave a place of ease and safety for one of danger. He has known nothing but service to our country. Not more than three or four men, living or dead, have rendered services to the Union as conspicuous and splendid as his have been. And they have been voluntary—no man more so. Garfield volunteered for a year; he volunteered for life. He has not been embroiled in any of the petty strifes of partisanship. His career has shown no narrowness. He has served the Union in battle, and has loved the civil liberty in peace. He has gone to the front of the National Administration in the true spirit of Union. His action will mean peace. It will mean the extinguished embers of sectional bitterness. It will take that baneful influence altogether out of our politics. It will be impossible for the Republican managers to again make this passion a political issue. This will be a great boon to an industrial, peaceful Republic, a beneficence to all the the people of all sections of the country. It will secure that pacification which even the most unscrupulous and professing Republicans, and which the Republican masses, sincerely do desire. Are the American people prepared to back these priceless tokens of peace?

James A. Garfield is the sectional candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Winfield Scott Hancock is the National candidate, the Union candidate.—*Cincinnati Enquirer*.

---

**The Soldier Stampede to Hancock.**

The attempt to check the movement of soldiers to the support of Hancock by proscription in the departments will not succeed. All over the country the men who fought the battles of the Union, who aided Hancock in stamping the life out of the rebellion, who followed the changing fortunes of war through alternating periods of light and darkness, who saw the supremacy of the Union was asserted and the old flag was respected on every foot of our national domain—these men, everywhere, are showing a strong inclination to rally under the banner of the gallant soldier who bears the Democratic standard in this campaign.

And thousands of them in every Northern State are breaking away from the Republican party in obedience to the same high sense of public duty that impelled them to take up arms against the rebellion and fight it, as Hancock did, until it was dead. They are patriotic citizens. Their creed is that their

acts should be such as will best promote the public welfare. They went into the war because they felt that the success of the Confederacy would be the destruction of the best Government on earth. They fought for the restoration of the Union. They will not believe and they can't possibly be made to believe, that the object for which they sacrificed so much, and for which so many of their comrades died, was not attained.

They believe the Union is restored. They are confident that General Grant told the truth when he said, in his tour up the Mississippi, that he had seen, in every State of the defunct Confederacy, the most convincing proofs that the men of the South were as loyal to the Union, and as devoted to the old flag as the people of any Northern State. They have seen enough of sectional hate, and of the wronging of the bloody shirt chorus, until they are sick of it; have witnessed the untiring efforts of the radical leaders to fan the embers of expiring malice into flames until their very souls loathe the old shibboleths and mottoes by which the Northern heart has been fired until it has ceased to respond to old influences.

These men recognize, in the cheerful alacrity with which the South comes to the support of a soldier like Hancock, the best possible evidence of a desire on the part of the Southern people to get their feet out of the old sectional ruts, and put our politics upon a higher plane. They are with Hancock in this campaign for the same reason that they were with him at Gettysburg and other fields where he earned his immortal fame—because they are sure that the future of our country will be happier, more prosperous and more glorious if the cause which he represents is triumphant.

Against this patriotic impulse how poor, how small, how impotent are such devices as the discharge of a gallant soldier like Captain Hamlin from a departmental position for declaring that he would support Hancock. True, the sneaks who discharged him wanted him to resume his place when they found that the discharge of a gentleman of influence would not tamper the Illinois ranks, but this only aggravates the original business. Captain Hamlin spurned their offer with the contempt that is shared by the whole country.

As persecution is the seed of the church, so this sort of proscription, which is being tried in not less than three of the departments, will but add to the tide it is intended to check. The soldiers will rally to the Hancock column. They will vote for the great General who fought to the end of the war, and whose record is spotless, rather than for the smaller General who left them in the midst of the terrible conflict to take a civil office far to the rear.—*Washington Post.*

The Democratic campaign of 1880 has opened most auspiciously. Several weeks have elapsed since the National nominations were made, and it is more and more evident, from day to day, that they are completely satisfactory to the

men are completely sincere and original in their political and social philosophy. The bright smiles which illumined the faces of good Democrats, when the name of Hancock appeared on the bulletin boards as the nominee, have given way to an expression of calm content and cheerful determination—a content which awaits the coming triumph, and a determination which means that nothing shall be left undone to elect the best man to the Presidency. The general enthusiasm of the party for the ticket, it is genuine and deep. All sections of the country share in it. The East, the great Middle States, the South and the West have echoed congratulations upon it, one to another. Hancock's character, his brilliant and patriotic military achievements and his statesmanlike utterances, when demanded by proper occasions, have made him one of the most distinguished Presidential candidates that the people have ever had an opportunity to vote for; while his associate on the ticket, Mr. English is a gentleman well known, both in public and private life, as of strict integrity and a high order of ability. Of such candidates the Democrats of the country may well be proud. They are men of high standing from among many honored names, which does credit to themselves and which appeals directly to the patriotism and sound judgment of the people at large. In presenting the names of Hancock and English as their National ticket, they have guaranteed not only to Democrats, but to thinking men of all parties, that it is their purpose to put in administration of public affairs the hands of the best known and the highest character, and the most thorough patriotism. They have deserved success by their sagacity and public spirit, and their prospects of winning it are of the best. The distinguished representatives whom they have put forward will steadily attract to their support during the coming summer a large and honorable community which believes in honoring remarkable public service wherever it is found, and in trusting well-trying men. When to this strength, fairly

earned, is added that of the great party which in '76 carried every State now necessary to an election, victory is almost certain; defeat hardly possible. This year, however, we must not be satisfied with a mere victory. It must be overwhelming. It must be as decisive as Hancock's work at Gettysburg. The Democratic party has it in its power, by continuing to make judicious nominations and by the aid of them to sweep the country and to give them power. It is the duty of the House fully to support the Democratic Presidential party. Good Statesmen will not fail to do this. Our duty is to insist on it. It requires no further argument that it has

— The Republican speakers are all settling down to the conviction that "the war is not over;" that the rebellion was never suppressed, and that Lee is marching on Philadelphia. The poor fellows seem to be terribly distressed about it. — *Exchange.*

—The New York *Star* calls General Arthur's letter of acceptance, "a comical allusion to civil service."

—It is "said" that Mr. Conklin intends to take an active part in the New York canvass as soon as the hot weather is over, but according to all prognostications the heated term this year will extend away into November.

*Working Men's Post.*

—A Vermont officeholder recently said: "I know we shall have a very vigorous campaign in Vermont; the size of my assessment tells me that." This is the kind of political barometer that officeholders have cause to understand.—*Boston Statesman*.

—What has become of that fearful some official proof that General Hancock contemplated "heading a revolution for Tilden?" Awful "revolt." How did it get lost with Cardinal McCloskey's letter? Or has it gone up the spout with the explosion of that "oil tank?"

—McPherson, of the Republican Campaign Committee, says that "the outlook is very hopeful." Mac has got his 100 tons of campaign documents started off to the Postmasters, and he foolishly says they may be "lost in the post." The voters, however, are looking at the Republican candidates and the rotten record of the party they represent, and these are the arguments which will slaughter the Republican party "in the melancholy days of November."

member." — The Republicans hired a man the other day to put in a claim for a pension at the Pension office in Washington, representing that he was a Confederate soldier who had been wounded and was entitled to a pension from the United States Government. This game is too thin, but it shows the desperate feeling pervading the ranks of the sacrosanct, and that they will not hesitate to commit any act of perjury or forgery or to utter any falsehood to "help the party."

—In the opinion of one Garfield paper, it is not by inquiry into the details of his Congressional career, but "it is by taking the *large view* of Garfield that people will gain confidence in his character, and will be inspired with enthusiasm in the Republican campaign. The voter must wish the candidate by his life." If the Republican voters do that Garfield will be crushed under the load of DeGolyer's pavement blocks and Oakes Ames' memorandums.—*Hartford Times*.

—Speaking of E. W. Barber's conversion to Democracy the New York *World* says, very pertinently: "It is now in order for the stalwart papers to show conclusively that General Barber was a copperhead, and that a writ of excommunication from a general of the Republican army had been drawn up and signed and would have been served on him next morning at sun-up if he hadn't displayed the wise discretion of the dog that went down stairs when he saw his master put on his boots."

The Republican papers denounce as campaign falsehoods the charges made against Mr. Garfield by his opponents. They forget that it is his own evidence and the evidence of other Republicans that convicts him of being a party to the Credit-Mobilier infamy, and that lying about his connection with it under oath. They also forget that it is his own story, and the letter of Mr. Crittenden, who was one of the interested parties in the De Golyer paving contract, that convict him of taking \$3,000 of virtual bribe-money. They forget that it is the letter of the editor of the reports of Republican journals that convict him of carrying through the Salary Grab. Now some of these papers declare that he opposed the Salary Grab at every stage. On the other hand, he was an active participant in the proceedings by which the Back-Pay Steal was consummated, and on one occasion, when Mr. Cox, of this city, rose to protest, refused to recognize him, and forced the vote on the previous question. The *Troy Times*, an able and loyal Republican paper, referred to recently by Mr. Garfield, in his connection with its passage, in its issue of February 23, 1873, in the following terms:

[illegible]

This is the verdict of an honorable and loyal Republican journal on the Steal and the part Garfield had in effecting it. Eight days after, by a series of skillful parliamentary tactics, Mr. Garfield succeeded in carrying the shameful measure through by a vote of 102 against 95. Mr. Garfield, according to the record, voting "yea." Afterwards, when he found what a storm of protest and anger his vote had kindled in the country, and that it was going hard with any man who was in favor of it, Mr. Garfield prudently repented, and put the \$5,000 into the Treasury, doubtless feeling at the effect this display of conscience would have on the country. It reminds us of the negro who led his mates to a melon-patch, where they helped themselves, when he happened to think that the owner had "stored" the melons to punish who should steal them, and skulked away with his plunder, leaving his comrades to get over their sickness the best way they could. The people know the difference between cowardice and conscience, and will hold James A. Garfield responsible for the Bland-Sumner bill, as without his active aid earnest agency it would not have passed.—N. Y. Express.

**MALT**  
**UNFERMENTED**

**THIS MATCHLESS RENOVATOR** of feeble and exhausted constitutions is rich in the elements that go to nourish and strengthen the blood. It perfects digestion, stimulates the liver, kidneys, bowels and urinary organs, quiets the brain and nervous forces, and induces refreshing sleep. **MALT BITTERS** commend themselves to the weak, convalescent, overworked, debilitated, nervous, sleepless and melancholy as the purest, safest and most powerful restorative in medicine. Prepared by the **MALT BITTERS COMPANY, from Unfermented Malt and Hops. Sold everywhere.**

**MALT BITTERS COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.**

**MALT AND HOPS**

# **BITTERS**

**"THIRTY YEARS OF INCREASING POPULARITY."**

# **KIDNEY**

Bladder, Urinary and Liver Diseases, Dropsy, Gravel and Diabetes, are cured by

## **HUNT'S REMEDY,**

the Great Kidney and Liver Medicine.

## **HUNT'S REMEDY**

cures Bright's Disease, Retention or Nonretention of Urine, Pains in the Back, Loins, or Side.

## **HUNT'S REMEDY**

cures Intemperance, Nervous Diseases, General Debility, Female Weakness and Excesses.

## **HUNT'S REMEDY**

cures Biliousness, Headache, Jaundice, Sour Stomach, Dyspepsia, Constipation and Piles.

## **HUNT'S REMEDY**

**ACTS AT ONCE on the Kidneys, Liver, and Bowels, restoring them to a healthy action, and CURES when all other medicines fail. Hundreds have been saved who have been given up to die by friends and physicians.**

Send for pamphlet to

**WY. E. CLARKE, Providence, R. I.**  
Trial size, 75 cents. Large size cheapest.  
**SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS.**

VERY EASILY MANAGED,  
ECONOMICAL IN FUEL,  
AND GUARANTEED TO  
Give Perfect Satisfaction Everywhere.

BUY

**A CHARTER OAK**

MADE ONLY BY

**Excelsior Man'g Co.,**

ST. LOUIS, MO.

IMPORTERS AND DEALERS IN

**TIN-PLATE, WIRE,  
SHEET IRON**

—AND—

EVERY CLASS OF GOODS USED OR SOLD BY

**TIN AND STOVE DEALERS.**

SEND FOR PRICE LISTS.

CAN MAKES PEN PAT

**Platform Family Scale**  
Weighs accurately up to 25 lbs. Its handsome appearance sells it as right to housekeepers. Retail price \$2.50. Other family scales weigh 10 lbs. and are bought for less than \$1. A regular \$3.00 for 4.50 in lots.

Exclusive territory given. Terms and rapid sales surprise old agents. Send for particulars.

**DOMESTIC SCALE CO., 198 W. 24 St., Cincinnati, Ohio**